



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,244	05/10/2001	Gordon Good	033048-058	4076
21839	7590	08/23/2006	EXAMINER CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/852,244	GOOD, GORDON	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Paul Callahan	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>          </u> <i>PC</i>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-36 are pending in the instant application and have been examined.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5-30-06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues in traverse of the rejections of the claims under 35 USC 102, as anticipated by Rothermal US 6,678,827, by asserting that Rothermal fails to teach the features found in the independent claims of expanding at least one template at a central location and subsequently providing the expanded information to a plurality of computing devices. The applicant maintains that the cited portions of Rothermal merely teach provision of a template to a computing device and subsequently expanding the template at the device. The Examiner counters that, while Rothermal does indeed teach such local expansion where a network security device (henceforth NSD) receives a template and then expands it by the addition of NSD specific information, the Rothermal patent also teaches expansion of a template at a central location with later distribution of the expanded information to a plurality of computing devices. For example, in col. 10 line 8 through col. 11 line 17 Rothermal teaches the use of a graphical user interface by an administrator to establish a security policy (e.g. Alias lists) in a template with subsequent distribution of the template to a plurality of computing devices (NSD's). Such establishment of security policies for a network in a template does read on the applicant's claim limitation of "expansion" of a template.

The applicant argues that the Rothermal patent fails to teach a “communications gateway” as recited in claim 8. The Examiner counters that the manager device, taught for example in col. 10 lines 12-15 of Rothermal, reads on the applicant’s communication gateway. The administrator does indeed perform the functions recited in claim 8 as per the discussion found supra.

The applicant argues in traverse of the rejection of claim 22 by asserting that Rothermal fails to teach the recited claim limitation of ‘*...retrieving a template that pertains to a given one of said devices and creating a document comprising a listing of users identified in said template and users identified by any externally referenced information...*’ Yet Rothermal teaches a template with an alias list that comprises such at col. 10 lines 37-47 where network addresses are incorporated into the alias list. The Examiner considers that the term “user” may reasonably be construed as a term of art to include a user device located at a specific IP address as is found in the alias list of Rothermal.

The applicant asserts that no conditional statement is associated with the list of users (or alias list) of Rothermal. Yet the security policy of Rothermal is associated with such a list as is taught in col. 10 lines 30-35 where for example, ftp connections are permitted by a policy filter only to users (IP addresses) found in the alias list.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. No changes have been made to the language of the claims via the latest amendment. Consequently no changes are necessitated in the rejections of the claims as set forth in the previous Office Action. Therefore the rejections of the claims as found in the previous Office action will not be repeated herein, but instead are hereby incorporated in their entirety by reference to the previous Office Action. The applicant is referred to the previous Office Action for the text of the rejections.

#### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2137

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

8-16-06

PEC

  
EMMANUEL L. MOISE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER